UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,645	08/25/2006	Yvonne Susanna Veldhuizen	F7764(V)	1494
201 7590 03/29/2011 UNILEVER PATENT GROUP 800 SYLVAN AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			TRAN LIEN, THUY	
AG West S. Wi ENGLEWOOD	ng CLIFFS, NJ 07632-31	100	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1789	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentgroupus@unilever.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Occurrence	10/590,645	VELDHUIZEN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Lien T. Tran	1789		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this co  (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
<ul> <li>1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Dec</li> <li>2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This</li> <li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		merits is	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-7 and 10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-7 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior  application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)	ate		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) U Other:				

Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Page 2

Claim 10 is vague and indefinite; the percent based on flour weight is unclear. Since the claim does not recite any other ingredient and the amount of flour, it is unclear if applicant is claiming a baker percentage which is based on 100% flour or some other weight.

Claims 2-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuan et al as evidence by Karppanen et al (EPO948265B1) submitted by applicant.

Yuan et al disclose a composition comprising sterol or stanol esterified with fatty acids and emulsifiers. The sterol or stanol derivatives can be esters of sunflower oil, cotton seed oil, palm oil etc... The emulsifier can be one emulsifier or mixture of emulsifiers selected from the group of lecithin, monglyceride, polysorbate, sodium stearoyl lactylate, DATEM, glyceryl monostearate. The amount of emulsifier is present in the composition in amount of about 1% to about 5%. The amount of sterol or stanol ester is from about 30-90%. The amount of the composition in food product will depend upon the formulation; a typical range is from about 5-20%. The foods include baked products such as bread, cakes, brownies etc... (see col. 1 line 63 through col. 2 line 25, col. 3 lines 43-62, col. 4, col. 6 lines 22-42)

The amount of emulsifier can be about 1% and the amount of sterol ester can be up to about 90%; thus the ratio of emulsifier to sterol can be from 1:30 to 1:90 when 1%

Art Unit: 1789

emulsifier is used. The ratio can range from 1:6 to 1:18 when the upper range of emulsifier is used. Both of these ranges include ratios falling with the claimed range. Yuan et al do not disclose the amount of the food ingredient containing the sterol or stanol ester and emulsifiers based on the weight of the flour. However, they do teach the amount of composition can vary depending on the food formulation. The amount of flour can vary depending on the type of baked product. For example, a known bread formulation disclosed in Karppanen et al contains 30kg flour. If 20% of the food ingredient is used in a bread formulation containing 30 kg of flour, then the amount of the food ingredient in 6kg. Out of which 90% or less can be the sterol ester. If 90% of sterol ester is used, then the % of sterol ester is 18%, but if 70% sterol ester is used, then the % of sterol ester is used, then the % of emulsifier is 1%. Thus, the calculation based on flour or total percentage is readily apparent to one skilled in the art and can be readily determined without undue experimentation. The calculation based on flour or total percentage does not lead to a different product.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1408. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/590,645 Page 4

Art Unit: 1789

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

March 23, 2011

/Lien T Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1789